

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/995,792 11/29/2001 David Ronen RONEN=1 9149 1444 7590 10/05/2005 **EXAMINER** BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. NGUYEN, DUC MINH 624 NINTH STREET, NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303 2643

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	Application No. Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/995,7	92	RONEN ET AL.		
		Examine		Art Unit		
		Duc Nguy		2643		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on th	e cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	idress	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FOR EXPENSE IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING INSIGNS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate penod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory are to reply within the set or extended penod for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the end patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF TH CFR 1.136(a). In no ev tion. I period will apply and w y statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATIO ent, however, may a reply be ti rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  n the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	•					
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
~=			This action is non-final.			
3)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
-,	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims	•	,			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
·	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.					
· · · · ·						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election r	equirement.			
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International E	Bureau (PCT Ru	e 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		•				
				٠.		
Attachmen	We)					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  1) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  6) Other:					O-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/995,792

Art Unit: 2643

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolting et al (6,298,123) in view of Johnson et al (5,345,595).

Consider claim 1-6, 8, 13-20. Nolting teaches a method for detecting a fraud event in a distributed telecommunications network (the network in fig(s). 4-5), wherein the distributed network (in fig(s). 4-5) inherently enables performance of at least two functions selected from a list comprising an access function, a transport function, an application function, a management function and a security function (col(s). 20, line(s) 41-60), by respective functional groups of elements and wherein each of the groups comprising at least one element capable of performing operations related to at least the function of the particular functional group and operative to create records (call detail record CDR, see fig(s). 4) on the operations the method comprising steps of obtaining records data related to at least one telecommunications session (col(s). 9, line(s) 19-29) and originating from one or more of the elements (see fig(s). 5-7) belonging to at least two the functional groups, analyzing the records data (col(s). 10, line(s) 10-27; col(s). 14, line(s) 32-67). Nolting does not teach analyzing the records data respectively obtained from the at

Art Unit: 2643

least two functional groups, if the lack of consistency is determined, concluding that there is a fraud event.

Johnson teaches analyzing the records data thus obtained to determine whether there is a lack of consistency between the records data respectively obtained from the at least two functional groups, if the lack of consistency is determined, concluding that there is a fraud event (col(s) 6, line(s) 33 through col(s) 8, line(s) 8) for the purpose of detecting potentially fraudulent telecommunication system usage (col(s) 1, line(s) 8-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Johnson into the teachings of Nolting for the purpose mentioned above.

Consider claim 7. Col(s). 9, line(s) 19-29 of Nolting and col(s). 8, line(s) 9-68 of Johnson read on the limitations of this claim.

Consider claims 9-12. Fig(s). 3A-L and fig(s). 4A-L of Johnson read on the limitations of these claims.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7503. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM to 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kuntz Curtis can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Duc Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643

9/30/05